



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/463,096	04/12/2000	HANS TANDLER	GK-ZEI-3078	5855
26418	7590	09/25/2003		
REED SMITH, LLP ATTN: PATENT RECORDS DEPARTMENT 599 LEXINGTON AVENUE, 29TH FLOOR NEW YORK, NY 10022-7650			EXAMINER	
			FINEMAN, LEE A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2872	

DATE MAILED: 09/25/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Advisory Action</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	09/463,096	TANDLER ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Lee Fineman	2872

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

THE REPLY FILED 09 September 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY** [check either a) or b)]

a)  The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1.  A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.

2.  The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:

- (a)  they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b)  they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
- (c)  they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d)  they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.

3.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.

4.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

5.  The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.

6.  The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.

7.  For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: 13-15 and 17-23.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

8.  The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.

9.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.

10.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

  
**MARK A. ROBINSON**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

Continuation of 2. NOTE: The new issues are at the least the removal of the claim limitation directed to without a monitoring system for the driving motors.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the claims as finally rejected do not distinguish the claimed system from the cited prior art.

Further, Applicant argues that the finality of the office action was inappropriate and was not necessitated by amendment. Applicant is reminded that this is the third action since the incorporation of claim 16 in modified form into claim 13. The final rejection mailed 9/24/02 was in response to the amendment filed 2/24/03 in which claim 16 had been previously cancelled. Therefore, no argument was present in this amendment directed to claim 16's allowable subject matter. Further, the claims were amended in a way which changed the scope from "without an ADDITIONAL monitoring system" to "without a monitoring system." The previous language permitted reading the claims as a system with a monitoring system. As such, the new rejection was necessitated by amendment and the finality is appropriate and is being maintained.

Applicant also challenges the assertion that use of direct drive motors like stepper motors are well known in the art. Applicant may refer to Sarfaty et al, U.S. Patent No. 5,741,171, as showing features that were stated in the final rejection as well known.